REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in light of the amendments herein.

Claims 1-3, 6-9 and 11-15 are presented for consideration.

Claim 1 has been amended to include those elements of claim 5 that may have been inadvertently omitted from the amendment made to claim 1 on February 2, 2004. Claim 5, which was cancelled by the amendment of February 2, 2004, was indicated as being allowable. It is respectfully submitted that claim 1, which includes the features of claim 5, is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 1, as well as the rejection of claims 2, 3 and 7 which depend from claim 1, should be withdrawn.

Claim 8 was rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph as allegedly failing to be supported by the written description. The Examiner's attention is respectfully directed to page 10, lines 19-21, which state,

> "As shown in Fig. 4 and Fig. 5 the phases of subsequent symbols φk and $\varphi k - N$, respectively on the same subcarrier are differentially modulated and demodulated, whereas the amplitude A_k is coherently processed."

The paragraph bridging pages 10 and 11 continues,

> "Often, wireless broadband systems adopt QPSK modulation of control data, for better robustness in frequency selective channels, and 16 QAM or higher modulation for useful data. In the system used for simulation, the frame structure of Fig. 6 has been adopted comprising 200 OFDM symbols in the QPSK modulated control signal and 4800 OFDM symbols in the 16 QAM modulated data signals ..."

Finally, page 11, lines 15-17, as referenced by the Examiner, state,

> "If only 16 QAM signals are available, a running mean of the correcting factors can **also** be performed over a time window, where the channel is supposed to be static." (Emphasis added.)

It is respectfully submitted that claim 8 is fully consistent with the aforequoted portions of the instant specification. It is pointed out that claim 8 states that the phases of symbols on the same carrier as the QAM symbols are "subsequent symbols." This is represented by the frame structure of Fig. 6. The specification discloses that the running mean of the correction factor "can also be performed over a time window." This is what is recited in claim 8, namely, "for amplitude correction of the receiver, a running mean of the correction factor is performed over a defined time window."

Therefore, since all of the elements recited in claim 8 find clear support in the specification, it is respectfully submitted that this claim is in compliance with 35 USC 112, first paragraph; and the rejection of claim 8 under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, should be withdrawn.

Claims 6, 9, 11 and 14 have been amended to correct inadvertent errors. The expression "QFDM" in claim 6 was a typographical error and should have been -- OFDM --. The variables "n" and "m" recited in claims 9 and 11 are integers, as is clear from the specification, and the claims have been amended to state the obvious, namely, that n and m are integers. Claim 14 has been amended as suggested by the Examiner, simply to improve the form of the claim.

Accordingly, Claims 1-3, 6-9 and 11-15 are in condition for allowance; and early notice to that effect is requested.

Submitted herewith is a new drawing Fig. 1 that includes the changes noted by the Examiner.

In light of the foregoing, entry of this Amendment, and the allowance of this application with Claims 1-3, 6-9 and 11-15 are respectfully solicited.

In the event that additional cooperation in this case may be helpful to complete its prosecution, the Examiner is cordially invited to contact Applicant's representative at the telephone number written below.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

By 
William S. Frommer
Reg. No. 25,506
(212) 588-0800